



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,161	09/30/2003	Kurt A. Dobbins	0016.0025US1	9818
29127	7590	11/07/2008		
HOUSTON ELISEEVA 4 MILITIA DRIVE, SUITE 4 LEXINGTON, MA 02421			EXAMINER KEEFE, MICHAEL E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2454	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,161

Applicant(s)

DOBBINS, KURT A.

Examiner

MICHAEL E. KEEFER

Art Unit

2454

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed 8/13/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moskowitz (US 20030200439) in view of Tarnoff (US 20020161680).

Regarding claims 1, 19 and 25, Moskowitz discloses:

A method of according preferred transport to a content file, the method comprising:

providing a content aware node, the node being contained in a transmission path of the content file; ([0012] "a network receiver to receive a packet" (the second sentence of the paragraph, see also claims 16 and 17)

identifying at the content aware node any portion of the content file to be transmitted; ([0012] the network receiver identifies if there is a watermark in the packet, which identifies the content which is being transported by the packet)

determining transport parameters at the content aware node based on the identified content file for transmission; ([0011] discloses authenticating the watermark (i.e. determining authentication of the watermark, also [0013] discloses a bandwidth rights certificate)

transmitting the at least part of identified content for transmission based on the determined transport parameters; and providing the identified content for transmission to a user requested location. ([0011] (at the top of page 3) in the event that the analysis does not authenticate the packet the invention may: i) halt the transmission of the data; ii) modify the data being transmitted to degrade the quality, and/or iv) delay the transmission)

wherein the content tag designates a content class ([0013] discloses priority data)

wherein identifying the content file for transmission includes: reading a content tag. ([0044] discloses reading the watermark)

Moskowitz discloses all the limitations of claims 1, 19 and 25 except for the watermark including a type of the content file.

The general concept of including the type of a content file in a watermark is well known in the art as taught by Tarnoff (see [0191]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Moskowitz with the general concept of including the type of a content file in a watermark as taught by Tarnoff in order to allow additional filtering, blocking or enhancements to the content. (Tarnoff, abstract)

Regarding **claims 2-6, 8-14, and 17-18**, Moskowitz discloses:

2. The method according to claim 1, wherein the content is electronic data.

([0011-0012] the information being transmitted in packets is electronic data)

3. The method according to claim 1, wherein the content is media content.

([0106] discloses image or audio files)

4. The method according to claim 1, wherein the content aware node is selected from a group consisting of an application specific node, a client node, a server node, and a network communication node. ([0012] discloses a network communication node)

5. The method according to claim 1, wherein transmitting at least part of the content includes: transmitting the content with the determined transport parameters over a peer- to-peer network. ([0008] discloses peer-to-peer networks)

6. The method according to claim 1, wherein identifying the content for transmission enables control on distribution of the content by at least one selected from a group consisting of an owner of the content, a peer-to-peer network, and a service provider. ([0016] discloses a service provider controlling the bandwidth of a purchased item)

8. The method according to claim 7, wherein reading the content tag includes reading: a multi-element content tag. (see [0036]-[0042] as well as [0031])

9. The method according to claim 1, wherein the determined transport parameters include at least one selected from a group consisting of a predetermined amount of bandwidth, a quality of service, a transmission attribute, an amount of packet loss, and an amount of jitter. ([0013], [0015], and

[0016] all disclose bandwidth as being determined by the watermark, additionally [0011] discloses delay and changes in the quality of data)

10. The method according to claim 9, wherein the determined transport parameter is a predetermined amount of bandwidth. ([0013], [0015], and [0016] all disclose bandwidth as being determined by the watermark, additionally [0011] discloses delay and changes in the quality of data)

11. The method according to claim 1, identifying the content file for transmission occurs at the time an application is accessed. ([0012] discloses that the watermarks are identified at the time that the processor for identifying watermarks is accessed (i.e. an application for identifying watermarks))

12. The method according to claim 1, further comprising transmitting unidentified content based on transport parameters different from the determined transport parameters. ([0011] discloses transporting unidentified content differently than properly identified content.)

13. The method according to claim 13, wherein the different parameters comprise a lower level of transport service. ([0011] discloses transporting unidentified content differently than properly identified content.)

14. The method according to claim 1, further comprising: authenticating the distribution allowed for the content, and authorizing only the allowed distribution for the content. ([0045] discloses checking that the content is authentic)

17. The method according to claim 1, wherein the user requested location is a device. ([0044] discloses at least sending the content to another router, if not sending it to a final destination)

18. The method according to claim 17, wherein the device is one selected from a group consisting of personal computer, a minicomputer, a microcomputer, a mainframe computer, a personal digital assistant, a hand-held device, a set-top box, a cellular telephone, an IP telephone, a videophone, a videogame machine, a television, and a personal video recorder. ([0007] discloses napster, which is used to send content from a PC to a PC)

Regarding **claims 19-25**, Moskowitz discloses:

Claims 19 and 25 are substantially the same as claim 1, therefore the grounds of rejection for claim 1 stated above apply.

20. The method of claim 19, wherein identifying the content occurs at the time an application is accessed. ([0012] discloses that the watermarks are identified at the time that the processor for identifying watermarks is accessed (i.e. an application for identifying watermarks))

21. The method according to claim 19, wherein transmitting the identified content file for transmission includes: transmitting the content file over a network in which clients and servers are distributed such that an owner of the content file does not own the server element on which the content file is stored. ([0044], it is clear that

the transmitter of the data does not own the routers which the data is transmitted over, nor does the transmitter own the destination of the content.)

22. The method according to claim 19, further comprising: authenticating the distribution allowed for the content, and authorizing only the allowed distribution for the content. ([0011] discloses halting the distribution of unauthenticated content)

23. The method according to claim 19, wherein the user requested location is a device. ([0044] discloses at least sending the content to another router, if not sending it to a final destination)

24. The method according to claim 23, wherein the device is one selected from a group consisting of personal computer, a minicomputer, a microcomputer, a mainframe computer, a personal digital assistant, a hand-held device, a set-top box, a cellular telephone, an IP telephone, a videophone, a videogame machine, a television, and a personal video recorder. ([0007] discloses napster, which is used to send content from a PC to a PC)

4. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moskowitz and Tarnoff as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Jennings et al. (US 2002/0099842), hereafter Jennings.

Regarding claim 16, Moskowitz discloses:

wherein generating the flow information for the content further comprises: retrieving a transport profile corresponding to the content tag from at least one

selected from a group consisting of an external database, a look up table, and a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) serving agent. ([0045] discloses comparing the watermark with a table of known watermarks to determine the authenticity of the watermark, therefore deciding whether to transport the data or not.)

Moskowitz and Tarnoff teach all the limitations of claims 16 and 19 except for including geographic restrictions.

The general concept of using geographic restrictions to limit content distribution is well known in the art as taught by Jennings. (See [0137]-[0139])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Moskowitz and Tarnoff with the general concept of using geographic restrictions to limit content distribution as taught by Jennings in order to enable the content owner to control who views its content with more granularity. (Jennings [0039])

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments regarding the added limitations to the claims are moot due to the new rejection above.
6. The examiner disagrees with Applicant's statement on page 9 of the remarks submitted 8/13/2008 that "the watermark in the Moskowitz does not identify the portion of the content file to be transmitted and determine the transport perimeters of the content file to be transmitted".

7. Paragraph 13 discloses the information that may be included within the bandwidth rights certificate (part of "the watermark"). The Examiner first notes [0026-0027] which discuss routers giving 'express, regular or slow' delivery dependent upon a label. Moskowitz explains that it is necessary to encode this level into a watermark to make sure that only the appropriate content is given 'express' delivery. Even further, [0030] discloses using the 4 MSBs of the watermark to identify a QoS -level-, which clearly provides even more granularity to the QoS levels than even express, regular, or slow.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL E. KEEFER whose telephone number is (571)270-1591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEK 11/4/2008

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446